



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/687,092	10/12/2000	Andrew E. Blau	CA9-1998-0006	9550

7590 03/27/2003

David A. Mims, Jr.
International Business Machines Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Department
Internal Zip 4054, 11400 Burnet Road
Austin, TX 78758

EXAMINER

CHUONG, TRUC T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/687,092

Applicant(s)

BLAU ET AL.

Examiner

Truc T Chuong

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hughes (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,223 B1).

As to claim 1, Hughes teaches a method for managing messages, comprising the steps of:

displaying a message to a user (col. 3 lines 50-52 and fig. 15);
accepting from said user an annotation to said message (figs. 15 and 18);
associating said annotation with said message (fig. 18); and
thereafter selectively displaying said annotation with said message (fig. 18).

As to claim 2, Hughes teaches the method of claim 1, said selectively displaying step further comprising the steps of:

displaying with said message indicia representing the existence of said annotation
(annotation data exist, col. 13 lines 52-56);
selectively receiving from said user a request to display said annotation (col. 13
lines 52-56); and
displaying said annotation with said message (fig. 18).

Art Unit: 2174

As to claim 3, Hughes teaches the method of claim 1, said accepting step further comprising the steps of:

selectively presenting to said user an edit panel; and
receiving from said user said annotation input to said edit panel (fig. 18).

As to claim 4, Hughes teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

selecting a message from a first file of messages for display to said user; and
associating in a second file said annotation to a corresponding message in said first file (annotation data and matching the line numbers of the original source code and the new source code, col. 3 lines 58-67).

As to claim 5, Hughes teaches the method of claim 4, further comprising the steps of:

providing message identifying indicia for each message in said first file;
generating annotation identifying indicia as a function of said message identifying indicia (col. 14 lines 52-57 and fig. 18).

As to claim 6, Hughes teaches the method of claim 4, further comprising the steps of:

upon presenting a message from said first file, determining the presence of a corresponding annotation in said second file (first and second data entry windows, col. 14 lines 52-55);

responsive to the presence of said corresponding annotation, displaying with said message indicia representing the existence of said annotation (problem or comment, col. 14 lines 56-57);

selectively receiving from said user a request to display said annotation (activating, col. 14 lines 48-49); and

Art Unit: 2174

responsive to receiving the request from said user, displaying said annotation with said message (col. 14 lines 43-57 and figs. 15, 17-18).

As to claim 7, Hughes teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

during processing of application code entered by a user, identifying an error in said code (col. 6 lines 20-21);

selecting and presenting to said user an error message corresponding to said error (col. 15 lines 8-18);

identifying and presenting to said user an annotation corresponding to said error message (col. 4 lines 1-11); and

enabling and selectively receiving an annotation and a modified annotation from said user for association with said error message (fig. 18).

As to claim 8, Hughes teaches the method of claim 7, further comprising the steps of:

preserving a history of error messages presented to said user (col. 6 lines 22-23);

enabling user selection of an error message from said history of error messages (col. 13 lines 52-60); and

selectively receiving from said user an annotation to the error message selected from said history (col. 14 lines 22-36).

As to claim 9, Hughes teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of presenting said annotation to other users receiving said message (communicate over the Network, col. 14 lines 22-26).

As to claim 10, Hughes inherently teaches the method of claim 4 further comprising the step of enabling access by other users to said second file because Hughes's workstations are

Art Unit: 2174

communicated over the network (col. 14 lines 20-25), and second code display window 1502 (col. 12 lines 23-37) of fig. 15 can be viewed and controlled throughout the network.

As to claim 11, it is individually similar in scope to claim 1 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 12, this is a system claim of method claim 1. Note the rejection of claim 1 above.

As to claim 13, Hughes teaches a system for presenting messages in a user display, comprising:

- a first file for storing a plurality of messages, each said message identified by a message key;

- a second file for storing a plurality of annotations, each said annotation associated with a corresponding said message (col. 4 lines 27-29, col. 14 lines 1-25 and fig. 16);

- a first event driven control component for selecting from said first file a display message from said first file for presentation in said user display (col. 14 lines 27-36);

- a second event driven control component for determining the presence in said second file of an annotation associated with said display message (col. 14 lines 19-21);
- and

- a third event driven control component for displaying said associated annotation in said user display (col. 14 lines 40-57).

As to claim 14, Hughes teaches the system of claim 13, further comprising a fourth control component responsive to entry in said user display of a message annotation to a

Art Unit: 2174

displayed message, for adding said message annotation to said second file associated with said displayed message (edit annotation window, col. 14 lines 52-57).

As to claim 15, Hughes teaches the system of claim 14, further comprising an editor for receiving via an annotation panel in said user display said message annotation (edit annotation window, col. 14 lines 52-57 and fig. 18).

As to claims 16 and 17, these are computer program product claims of claim 1. Note the rejections of claim 1 above.

As to claim 18, this is a computer program product claim of system claim 12. Note the rejection of claim 12 above.

As to claims 19-30, these are computer program product claims of method claims 2-11 and 13-14. Note the rejections of claims 2-11 and 13-14 above respectively.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Eick (U.S. Patent No. 5,644,692) teaches annotation, debug, messages, and user interaction (col. 2-37 and figs. 5-17).

Grief et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,371,675) teach debugging tools, messages, annotation, and GUI (cols. 1-36 and figs. 2-10).

Hennum et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,259,445 B1) teach annotation, files, debug, and display (cols. 2-14 and figs. 3-19).

Art Unit: 2174

Hernandez et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,723,209) teach annotation, objects, editor, and error messages (cols. 2-23 and figs. 1-18).

Leshem et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,559) teach annotation, note, messages, and interactive with code (cols. 1-118 and figs. 1-24).

Ludwig et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,617,539) teach annotation, editing, messages, and display (cols. 2-41 and figs. 2-41).

Schmitz (U.S. Patent No. 5,128,871) teaches program logic, annotation, debug, and display (cols. 1-67).

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Truc T Chuong whose telephone number is 703-305-5753. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Truc T. Chuong
March 24, 2003

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100